

February 28, 1972 meeting in BICC office including: Messrs. Youchah ~~& Fraunheim~~<sup>Inc</sup> from Personnel Data System<sup>Inc</sup> and Messrs. Roland Steward, Dick Proctor, Tom Boykin ~~██████████~~ and Jules Lozowick of BICC. (Joe Partenheimer from BICC part-time).

The meeting was called to clarify work BICC is doing for Personnel Data Systems, Inc.

Jules Lozowick opened the discussion by asking Mike Youchah what the original agreement was between Personnel Data Systems, Inc., (ADP-PDS) and BICC. Mike replied by suggesting it might be good to review the relationship of the organizations before we had this contract. He informed us that when Dave Ruff was the Executive Director of BICC, Personnel Data Systems, Inc., had a contract from BICC and this relationship in 1970 and the beginning of 1971 impressed ADP-PDS sufficiently for them to think of BICC when Personnel Data Systems, Inc., was looking for a contractor for their government project. Mike referred to a May 28, 1971 letter, which states that his organization is being funded by the office of Economic Opportunity to conduct a one year program in the placement of individuals into jobs. Therefore, ADP-PDS ~~would~~ <sup>would</sup> agree to supply BICC with \$85,500 contingent on BICC's ability to secure supporting funding from other sources. Joe Partenheimer interrupted Mike to remind him that BICC told ADP-PDS that we could not get refunded and if our people were to remain on-roll and if we were to do some work for ADP we would be working within the confines of monies received from ADP. Mike continued by telling us that the final contract was firmed-up in June 1971 for a program of handling 3,500 individuals requiring jobs and who were to be matched through the ADP-PDS System. BICC had informed ADP-PDS that in the previous year they had handled 1,347 applicants. Therefore, ADP assumed that a goal of 1,200 people to be processed by BICC in a nine-month period was realistic. Approximately 1,200 individuals were to be processed each by a Model Cities program in Perth Amboy and a Vocational Rehabilitation Program with the New Jersey State Employment Service in Hoboken. The agreement with BICC

included the hiring of 3½ people at an annual rate of \$24,000 or a pro-rated cost for nine months of \$18,000 plus start up cost of \$2,100 and an additional burden cost to BICC of approximately \$10,000 (this comes out to \$30,000 while I believe the figures presented by Mike showed an input to BICC of about \$32,000+ why the difference?) ADP-PDS requested BICC to be part of this contract because it felt being just across the river they could service the contract by helping to train our staff as required or to meet with companies or agencies as BICC requested.

Mr. Lozowick summarized what he said he thought he heard which was that the original agreement was on a time basis, but that in December ADP wrote a letter stating that they were now going to pay us on a performance basis. Mike answered that he believed that the goal of 1,200 was a firm figure.

In later discussions, Mike informed us that if we got into the ball park figure of 1,200 he would honor his commitment to us. It was pointed out by Mr. Steward that ADP surprised BICC by coming into Newark and working with TEAM, by using the Greater Newark Chamber of Commerce, and by setting up an office in the city. Mike informed us that his working with TEAM was a direct result of the three agencies working for him on this project all failing to meet their commitment. His commitment of 3,500 was for an approximate 12 mile area from the city of Newark. He needed to meet that commitment. *Roland* ~~was~~ pointed out to Mike that ~~was~~ <sup>ADP</sup> going to TEAM could inhibit our ability to attract people, as we were looking to TEAM as ~~being~~ one of our inputs. Mike agreed that if we could work it out with TEAM we could add their numbers to ours.

The discussion revolved around many issues of operations and misunderstandings between the organizations and we ~~hope~~ that many issues were clarified and hopefully there is greater trust between the organizations today, than before

the meeting. PMr. Lozowick informed Mike that we had begged and borrowed money from other sources of incomes to BICC to keep the ADP Project running and that, in fact, if we did not get monies from ADP-PDS, we would have to close down BICC. We informed Mike that we needed a minimum of \$5,000 before March 15 to continue to operate. We do not accept the proposition that we signed a performance contract or we should be paid on a performance basis, but the figures we presented to Mike showed that as of the end of January we had processed approximately 600 applicants and by the end of February, we would have processed over 700 applicants. If we pro-rated this performance over the \$32,000 for 1,200 applicant Mike says he agreed to pay for, ADP would owe us close to \$19,000 and having paid us \$10,700 they would owe us \$8,000 as of the end of February. Mike stated that he needed some time to get his own figures in order and that he would inform me by the end of this week the amount of monies that he could send to us and the group agreed to meet again March 6, at 1:00 p.m., BICC offices.

J. H. LOZOWICK

February 28, 1972 meeting in BICC office including: Messrs. Youchah ~~Fraunheim~~ from Personnel Data System, <sup>1/14</sup> and Messrs. Roland Steward, Dick Proctor, Tom Boykin ~~and~~ and Jules Lozowick of BICC. (Joe Partenheimer from BICC part-time).

The meeting was called to clarify work BICC is doing for Personnel Data Systems, Inc.

Jules Lozowick opened the discussion by asking Mike Youchah what the original agreement was between Personnel Data Systems, Inc., (ADP-PDS) and BICC. Mike replied by suggesting it might be good to review the relationship of the organizations before we had this contract. He informed us that when Dave Ruff was the Executive Director of BICC, Personnel Data Systems, Inc., had a contract from BICC and this relationship in 1970 and the beginning of 1971 impressed ADP-PDS sufficiently for them to think of BICC when Personnel Data Systems, Inc., was looking for a contractor for their government project. Mike referred to a May 28, 1971 letter, which states that his organization is being funded by the office of Economic Opportunity to conduct a one year program in the placement of individuals into jobs. Therefore, ADP-PDS <sup>could</sup> ~~would~~ agree to supply BICC with \$85,500 contingent on BICC's ability to secure supporting funding from other sources. Joe Partenheimer interrupted Mike to remind him that BICC told ADP-PDS that we could not get refunded and if our people were to remain on-roll and if we were to do some work for ADP we would be working within the confines of monies received from ADP. Mike continued by telling us that the final contract was firmed-up in June 1971 for a program of handling 3,500 individuals requiring jobs and who were to be matched through the ADP-PDS System. BICC had informed ADP-PDS that in the previous year they had handled 1,347 applicants. Therefore, ADP assumed that a goal of 1,200 people to be processed by BICC in a nine-month period was realistic. Approximately 1,200 individuals were to be processed each by a Model Cities program in Perth Amboy and a Vocational Rehabilitation Program with the New Jersey State Employment Service in Hoboken. The agreement with BICC

included the hiring of 3½ people at an annual rate of \$24,000 or a pro-rated cost for nine months of \$18,000 plus start up cost of \$2,100 and an additional burden cost to BICC of approximately \$10,000 (this comes out to \$30,000 while I believe the figures presented by Mike showed an input to BICC of about \$32,000+ why the difference?) ADP-PDS requested BICC to be part of this contract because it felt being just across the river they could service the contract by helping to train our staff as required or to meet with companies or agencies as BICC requested.

Mr. Lozowick summarized what he said he thought he heard which was that the original agreement was on a time basis, but that in December ADP wrote a letter stating that they were now going to pay us on a performance basis. Mike answered that he believed that the goal of 1,200 was a firm figure.

In later discussions, Mike informed us that if we got into the ball park figure of 1,200 he would honor his commitment to us. It was pointed out by Mr. Steward that ADP surprised BICC by coming into Newark and working with TEAM, by using the Greater Newark Chamber of Commerce, and by setting up an office in the city. Mike informed us that his working with TEAM was a direct result of the three agencies working for him on this project all failing to meet their commitment. His commitment of 3,500 was for an approximate 12 mile area from the city of Newark. He needed to meet that commitment. <sup>Reland</sup> ~~It was~~ <sup>ADP</sup> pointed out to Mike that his going to TEAM could inhibit our ability to attract people, as we were looking to TEAM as ~~being~~ one of our inputs. Mike agreed that if we could work it out with TEAM we could add their numbers to ours.

The discussion revolved around many issues of operations and misunderstandings between the organizations and we <sup>hope</sup> ~~believe~~ that many issues were clarified and hopefully there is greater trust between the organizations today, than before

the meeting. Mr. Lozowick informed Mike that we had begged and borrowed money from other sources of incomes to BICC to keep the ADP Project running and that, in fact, if we did not get monies from ADP-PDS, we would have to close down BICC. We informed Mike that we needed a minimum of \$5,000 before March 15 to continue to operate. We do not accept the proposition that we signed a performance contract or we should be paid on a performance basis, but the figures we presented to Mike showed that as of the end of January we had processed approximately 600 applicants and by the end of February, we would have processed over 700 applicants. If we pro-rated this performance over the \$32,000 for 1,200 applicant Mike says he agreed to pay for, ADP would owe us close to \$19,000 and having paid us \$10,700 they would owe us \$8,000 as of the end of February. Mike stated that he needed some time to get his own figures in order and that he would inform me by the end of this week the amount of monies that he could send to us and the group agreed to meet again March 6, at 1:00 p.m., BICC offices.

J. H. LOZOWICK